

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Stephen R. PALM

Application No.: 09/755,085

Filed: January 8, 2001

For: **Networked Audio Player  
Transport Protocol and Architecture**

Confirmation No.: 5148

Art Unit: 2153

Examiner: Bates, Kevin T.

Atty. Docket: 1875.0030001

**Brief on Appeal Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

*Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents*

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

A Notice of Appeal from the final rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-23 was filed on November 24, 2008. Appellants hereby file one copy of this Appeal Brief, together with the required fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2).

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 19-0036.

## Table of Contents

I.	Real Party In Interest (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i)) .....	3
II.	Related Appeals and Interferences (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii)) .....	3
III.	Status of Claims (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii)) .....	3
IV.	Status of Amendments (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv)) .....	5
V.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v)) .....	5
VI.	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi)) ...	9
VII.	Argument (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii)) .....	9
A.	Rejection of claims 1-10, 14, 16-18, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	9
B.	Rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	15
C.	Rejection of claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	15
D.	Conclusion .....	16
VIII.	Claims Appendix .....	17
IX.	Evidence Appendix .....	23
X.	Related Proceedings Appendix .....	24

***I. Real Party In Interest (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))***

The real party in interest in this appeal is Broadcom Corporation, having its principal place of business at 5300 California Avenue, Irvine, California, 92617. An assignment assigning all right, title and interest in and to the above-captioned patent application from inventor Stephen R. Palm to Broadcom Corporation was recorded in the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office (USPTO) on January 8, 2001 at Reel 011434, Frame 0833.

***II. Related Appeals and Interferences (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))***

Appellant, including the undersigned legal representative and the assignee of the above-captioned application, are aware of no pending appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences ("the Board") in the pending appeal.

***III. Status of Claims (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))***

This application was filed on January 8, 2001 and was assigned U.S. Application No. 09/755,085 ("the '085 application"). The '085 application included claims 1-16. In an Office Action dated May 06, 2004, claims 1-16 were rejected. In the Amendment and Reply filed on September 7, 2004, Appellant amended claims 4, 7, 11, and 16. Claims 17-20 were added.

A final Office Action was mailed on October 26, 2004. In the Office Action claims 1-20 were rejected. In response, Appellant filed an Amendment and Reply on January 26, 2005 and amended claims 7 and 9.

An Advisory Action was mailed on March 10, 2005. The Advisory Action maintained the rejection of claims 1-20. On April 6, 2005, Appellant filed a Request for

Continued Examination along with an Amendment. In the Amendment, Appellant amended claims 1, 8, and 14.

An Office Action was mailed on June 17, 2005, in which claims 1-20 were rejected. Appellant filed an Amendment and Reply on September 19, 2005 and amended claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16. Claims 11, 15, and 19 were cancelled.

A final Office Action was mailed on November 8, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20 were rejected. In response, Appellant filed an Amendment and Reply on January 9, 2006. In the Amendment, Appellant amended claim 20. In an Advisory Action mailed on February 8, 2006, the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20 was maintained.

A Notice of Appeal was filed March 8, 2006. Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20 are on appeal. A Brief on Appeal was filed May 5, 2006.

In response to the Brief on Appeal, prosecution was reopened and an Office Action was mailed on August 8, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20 were rejected. In response, Appellant filed an Amendment and Reply on February 8, 2007 and amended claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16. Claims 21 and 22 were added.

A final Office Action was mailed on March 20, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 were rejected. In response, Appellant filed a Reply on June 19, 2007.

In an Advisory Action mailed on July 6, 2007, the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 was maintained. A Pre-Appeal Brief Request and accompanying arguments were filed concurrently with a Notice of Appeal on August 20, 2007.

A Notice of Panel Decision was mailed on November 15, 2007. In the Notice of Panel Decision, the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 was maintained. On February 15, 2008, Appellant filed a Request for Continued Examination along with a Preliminary Amendment. In the Preliminary Amendment, Appellant amended claims 1, 6, 7, and 16. Claim 23 was added.

An Office Action was mailed on April 14, 2008. In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-23 were rejected. In response, Appellant filed an Amendment and Reply on July 14, 2008 and amended claims 1 and 6.

A final Office Action was mailed on August 22, 2008. In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-23 were rejected. A Notice of Appeal was filed November 24, 2008. Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-23 are on appeal. A copy of the claims on appeal can be found in the attached Claims Appendix.

***IV. Status of Amendments (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))***

No amendments have been filed by Appellants subsequent to the final Office Action mailed on August 22, 2008. All amendments to the claims previously presented during prosecution have been entered.

***V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))***

The claimed invention relates to a communications system consisting of a networked multimedia device or player and a media server that may be located within a home network or an external network. The claimed invention further provides for the selection of multimedia content from a centralized repository and delivering the multimedia content via a networking infrastructure to a networked multimedia device or player.

**Exemplary Support for Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for providing multimedia content over a network. The method comprises: connecting a multimedia device to a media server (Specification, p. 14, lines 6-7; FIG. 3) storing a plurality of multimedia clips over a communications network (Specification, p. 7, lines 7-24; p. 14, line 14); authenticating said multimedia device prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips (Specification, p. 7, lines 19-24; p. 16, line 18 - p. 17, line 3); generating a menu for selecting one or more specific clips from said plurality of selectable multimedia clips for playing by said multimedia device, whereby specific clips are selected by user interaction with the menu (Specification, p. 14, lines 11-15); generating a playlist that includes the selected one or more of said plurality of selectable multimedia clips (Specification, p. 14, lines 16-20; FIG. 3, box 325); transferring said generated playlist to said at least one multimedia device (Specification, p. 14, lines 16-20; FIG. 3, box 325).

**Exemplary Support for Independent Claim 7**

Independent claim 7 is directed to a method for receiving multimedia content over a network. The method comprises: (a) displaying a list of one or more media servers storing a plurality of selectable multimedia clips available to a multimedia device (Specification, p. 8, lines 13-16; p. 14, lines 6-10); (b) selecting a media server from said list of one or more media servers via a user interface (Specification, p. 8, lines 13-16; p. 13, line 25 - p. 14, line 10); (c) connecting to said selected media server (Specification, p. 14, lines 6-10); (d) receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device (Specification, p. 7, lines 19-24; p. 16, line 18 - p. 17, line 3); (e) selecting at least one of said stored plurality of multimedia clips from a menu generated by said media server for rendering by said one or more multimedia devices (Specification, p. 14, lines 11-15); (f) receiving

a playlist (Specification, p. 14, lines 16-20; FIG. 3, box 325); (g) parsing said playlist (Specification, p. 14, lines 27-28); and (h) rendering said selected at least one of said stored plurality of selectable multimedia clips by retrieving files defined in said playlist (Specification, p. 7, lines 12-13).

**Exemplary Support for Independent Claim 8**

Independent claim 8 is directed to a networked based multimedia delivery system comprising: (a) a media server having a plurality of multimedia clips (Specification, p. 8, lines 13-16; p. 14, lines 6-10); (b) a multimedia device having input means and display means (FIG. 2) through which a user may request multimedia clips and output means through which requested multimedia clips may be played (Specification, p. 10, lines 19-22) and authenticating means to authenticate and connect said multimedia device to said media server (Specification, p. 7, lines 19-24; p. 16, line 18 - p. 17, line 3), wherein said media server is configured to receive input of said user request for multimedia clips from said multimedia device and to generate a playlist file based on said user's request (Specification, p. 14, lines 11-20; FIG. 3, box 325), and wherein said media server transmits said playlist file to said multimedia device (Specification, p. 14, lines 16-20; FIG. 3, box 325); and (c) a local home communications network for interfacing said multimedia device with said at least one media server (Specification, p. 6, lines 8-15).

**Exemplary Support for Independent Claim 14**

Independent claim 14 is directed to a networked based multimedia delivery system comprising: (a) at least one media server for generating a playlist file clips from a plurality of centrally stored multimedia in response to user interaction with a menu generated by the server wherein the user identifies particular clips to be played (Specification, p. 10, lines 19-22; p. 14, lines 16-28); and (b) a multimedia device in communications with said at least one media server, wherein said media server is

configured to authenticate said multimedia device (Specification, p. 7, lines 19-24; p. 16, line 18 - p. 17, line 3), and wherein the multimedia device is configured to receive the playlist file from the media server and to parse the playlist file to obtain clips and play the specified playlist (Specification, p. 7, lines 27-30; p. 14, lines 16-18).

**Exemplary Support for Independent Claim 16**

Independent claim 16 is directed to a multimedia device for use in a network based multimedia delivery system. The system comprises: (a) means for automatically configuring the multimedia device on a communications network (Specification, p. 9, lines 8-9); (b) means for displaying at least one media server in communications with the multimedia device over said communications network, wherein said at least one media server has a plurality of stored multimedia clips (Specification, p. 14, lines 6-19); (c) means for providing authentication information to the at least one media server and for receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device (Specification, p. 7, lines 19-24; p. 16, line 18 - p. 17, line 3); (d) means for interactively searching said plurality of stored multimedia clips using all or a portion of a text string (Specification, p. 11, lines 1-8); (e) means for passively searching said plurality of stored multimedia clips (Specification, p. 10, lines 14-21); (f) means for requesting at least one of said plurality of stored multimedia clips from said at least one media server (Specification, p. 14, lines 11-15); (g) means for receiving a remotely generated playlist data file from said at least one media server over said communications network, wherein said remotely generated playlist data file is comprised of data identifying said requested at least one of said plurality of stored multimedia clips (Specification, p. 7, lines 7-13); (h) means for parsing said remotely generated data file (Specification, p. 7, lines 27-30); and (i) means



for displaying said remotely generated data file with local data (Specification, p. 10, lines 14-26).

***VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))***

A concise statement listing each ground of rejection presented for review follows.

***A. Ground 1***

Claims 1-10, 14, 16-18, 20, and 23 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,192,340 to Abecassis ("Abecassis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,015 to Day et al. ("Day"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,244 to Roy ("Roy").

***B. Ground 2***

Claims 12 and 13 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abecassis, in view of Day, in view of Roy, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,446,096 to Holland et al. ("Holland").

***C. Ground 3***

Claims 21 and 22 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abecassis, in view of Day, in view of Roy, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,479,536 to Comerford ("Comerford").

***VII. Argument (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))***

***A. Rejection of claims 1-10, 14, 16-18, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

At page 2 of the final Office Action (hereinafter "Office Action"), dated August 22, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 14, 16-18, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abecassis in view of Day, and in further view of Roy.

Appellant asserts that the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that the combination of Abecassis, Day, and Roy does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed embodiments. *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974); *see also In re Glaug*, 283 F.3d 1335, 1341-42, 62 U.S.P.Q.2d 1151, 1154 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

**Claim 1-6, 17, 18, 20, and 23**

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, “authenticating said multimedia device prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips.” The combination of Abecassis, Day, and Roy does not teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1. In particular, the combination of Abecassis, Day, and Roy does not teach or suggest authenticating, let alone authenticating a multimedia device.

The Examiner concedes, on page 3 of the Office Action, that the primary citation to “Abecassis does not explicitly indicate...the multimedia device is authenticated prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips.” Nevertheless, the Examiner contends that “Roy teaches a system with a client and server where the client receives multimedia content and clips from the server (Column 2, lines 25-36) where the server authenticates the user’s request for multimedia clips before the client can gain access (Column 5, lines 5-7).” (Office Action, p. 4.) Appellant respectfully disagrees that Roy teaches the claimed feature.

Roy is directed to an apparatus and method for providing conferencing services in conjunction with selective information services. (Roy, Col. 1, lines 38-48.) As described by Roy, a multimedia conference may be between many parties and each party may participate in the multimedia conference “using their own respective user devices.” (Roy, Col. 2, lines 48-50.) During a multimedia conference, the users participating may

wish to receive additional information services, “such as stock updates, sports scores, traffic reports, weather reports, and the like.” (Roy, Col. 2, lines 31-35 and lines 52-63.) A multimedia bridge is provided by Roy for receiving multimedia signals (e.g., audio, video, and/or data) sent between the user devices of a multimedia conference and for modifying the received multimedia signals to include additional information services requested by the user devices. (Roy, Col. 2, lines 40-47.) Thereafter, “the multimedia bridge sends the modified multimedia signals, including the information services, to the user devices.” (*Id.*)

To setup a multimedia conference, Roy discloses that a user device sends a multimedia conference request (i.e., start-up signals) to a multimedia bridge with required multimedia conference information. (Roy, Col. 4, lines 61-65.) The multimedia bridge examines the multimedia conference request to determine “whether the request is valid and/or has proper authorization.” (Roy, Col. 5, lines 5-9.) The multimedia bridge will send a rejection message to the user device attempting to begin the multimedia conference if the multimedia request is not valid and/or authorized. (*Id.*)

The Examiner equates this multimedia conference setup scheme described in Roy, with the feature “authenticating said multimedia device prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips” as recited by Appellant’s claim 1. However, authorization and authentication are not equivalent. Roy discloses a multimedia bridge that “examines whether the request is valid and/or has proper *authorization*.” (Roy, Col. 5, lines 5-6.) (Emphasis Added.) In complete contrast, Appellant’s claim 1 recites *authenticating* a multimedia device. Authentication, as is well known in the relevant art(s), establishes whether someone or something is, in fact, who or what it is declared to be (e.g., after having been registered). Authorization, on the other hand, is typically how a system

decides or determines what someone or something is permitted to do (e.g., being granted a requested type of access to a given resource).

The Examiner, in the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action, alleges that “it is impossible to provide authorization without authentication and vice versa.” (Office Action, p. 15). Appellant respectfully disagrees and provides the following analogy to further elucidate that authorization does not require authentication in all circumstances as the Examiner alleges.

Amusement parks often require passengers to be a certain, minimum height before authorizing passengers to board rides. Typically, a sign designating the minimum, required height is used for each ride; if a potential rider is taller than the minimum requirement designated by the sign, the rider is authorized to board the ride. The amusement parks, however, do not find out who the individuals are that are attempting to board the rides, i.e., the amusement parks do not authenticate each rider prior to boarding a ride. Consequently, authorization in this exemplary instance is provided without authentication.

The above described analogy may be modified to incorporate authentication. For example, an amusement park may require all patrons to carry a park issued photo ID to board rides. Specifically, before authorizing a patron to board a ride, an operator of the ride may authenticate the patron via their park issued ID. Although authentication may be provided in conjunction with authorization, this example further makes clear that authentication is by no means necessary and, therefore, not inherently present where authorization exists.

Moreover, in Roy a multimedia bridge examines a multimedia conference request to determine “whether the request is valid and/or has proper authorization.” (Roy, Col. 5,

lines 5-9.) Merely authorizing a multimedia conference *request*, as disclosed in Roy, is not sufficient to teach the aforementioned feature of Appellant's claim 1. Independent claim 1 recites authenticating *a multimedia device* (not merely a user or a user's request). Authenticating a multimedia device protects against unauthorized devices (not merely users) from downloading multimedia clips. This advantageous and non-obvious feature prevents a single user from downloading multimedia clips to unauthorized devices (whether owned by the user or a third party).

Day does not supply the missing teaching. Day is directed to a method for seamlessly joining together a plurality of multimedia files "prior to file delivery from a server library to network clients to enable a continuous and uninterrupted flow of multimedia data and a corresponding seamless video presentation of the selected files." (Day, Col. 2, lines 28-36.) Like Abecassis and Roy, Day does not teach or suggest "authenticating said multimedia device prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips" as recited by Appellant's claim 1.

Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1 for at least the reason that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

Claims 2-6, 17, 18, 20, and 23 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1, and further in view of their own features, claims 2-6, 17, 18, 20, and 23 are patentable over Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-6, 17, 18, 20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

**Claim 7**

Independent claim 7 recites, among other features, “receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device.” As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 7. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 7. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

**Claim 8-10**

Independent claim 8 recites, among other features, “authenticating means to authenticate and connect said multimedia device to said media server.” As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 8. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 8. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8. For at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 8, and further in view of their own features, claims 9 and 10 are patentable over Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

**Claim 14**

Independent claim 14 recites, among other features, “wherein said media server is configured to authenticate said multimedia device.” As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this

feature of claim 14. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

**Claim 16**

Independent claim 16 recites, among other features, “means for providing authentication information to the at least one media server and for receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device.” As noted above in regard to claim 1, Abecassis, Day, and Roy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 16. Therefore, there is no prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 16. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be reversed.

***B. Rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 12 and 13 depend from independent claim 8 and include the features recited therein. Holland does not overcome the deficiencies of Abecassis, Day, and Roy relative to independent claim 8 described above. For at least this reason, and further in view of their own features, the rejection of claims 12 and 13 must be reversed.

***C. Rejection of claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claim 21 depends from independent claim 1 and includes the features recited therein. Comerford does not overcome the deficiencies of Abecassis, Day, and Roy relative to independent claim 1 described above. For at least this reason, and further in view of their its own feature, the rejection of claim 21 must be reversed.

Claim 22 depends from independent claim 16 and includes the features recited therein. Comerford does not overcome the deficiencies of Abecassis, Day, and Roy

relative to independent claim 16 described above. For at least this reason, and further in view of its own feature, the rejection of claim 21 must be reversed.

**D. Conclusion**

The subject matter of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-23 is patentable over the cited art because the Examiner has failed to show that each and every feature of the claimed embodiments is taught in the cited references. Therefore, Appellants respectfully request that the Board reverse the Examiner's final rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and remand this application for issue.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 1/26/09

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600  
927110\_1.doc



***VIII. Claims Appendix***

1. A method for providing multimedia content over a network, comprising:  
  
connecting a multimedia device to a media server storing a plurality of multimedia clips over a communications network;  
  
authenticating said multimedia device prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips;  
  
generating a menu for selecting one or more specific clips from said plurality of selectable multimedia clips for playing by said multimedia device, whereby specific clips are selected by user interaction with the menu;  
  
generating a playlist that includes the selected one or more of said plurality of multimedia clips;  
  
transferring said generated playlist to said at least one multimedia device.
2. The method of claim 1 wherein said communications network is a local home communications network.
3. The method of claim 1 wherein said communications network is a public communications network.
4. The method of claim 1 wherein said communications network is the Internet.
5. The method of claim 1 wherein said playlist file comprises audio data.
6. The method of claim 1 further comprising:  
  
providing a list of said media servers connected to said at least one multimedia device.
7. A method for receiving multimedia content over a network, comprising:  
  
(a) displaying a list of one or more media servers storing a plurality of selectable multimedia clips available to a multimedia device;

(b) selecting a media server from said list of one or more media servers via a user interface;

(c) connecting to said selected media server;

(d) receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device;

(e) selecting at least one of said stored plurality of multimedia clips from a menu generated by said media server for rendering by said one or more multimedia devices;

(f) receiving a playlist;

(g) parsing said playlist; and

(h) rendering said selected at least one of said stored plurality of selectable multimedia clips by retrieving files defined in said playlist.

8. A networked based multimedia delivery system comprising:

(a) a media server having a plurality of multimedia clips;

(b) a multimedia device having input means and display means through which a user may request multimedia clips and output means through which requested multimedia clips may be played and authenticating means to authenticate and connect said multimedia device to said media server, wherein said media server is configured to receive input of said user request for multimedia clips from said multimedia device and to generate a playlist file based on said user's request, and wherein said media server transmits said playlist file to said multimedia device; and

(c) a local home communications network for interfacing said multimedia device with said at least one media server.

9. The networked based multimedia delivery system of claim 8 further comprising:

(a) an access link for connecting said local home communication network to said at least one media server over a public communications network; and

(b) an access gateway for translating communications protocols between said local home communications network and said access link.

10. The networked based multimedia delivery system of claim 9 wherein said public network is the Internet.

11. (Cancelled)

12. The networked based multimedia delivery system of claim 8 wherein said multimedia device is designed to

(a) be automatically configured on said local home communications network;

(b) resolve a host name in a URL using DNS call;

(c) issue HTTP request;

(d) receive HTTP responses containing MIME objects;

(e) display WML and HTML content;

(f) parse said playlist;

(g) interactively search a database of track, album, and playlist information;

(h) mix said playlist with local content; and

(i) receive channels of multimedia clips from said media server.

13. The networked based multimedia delivery system of claim 8 wherein said multimedia device is designed to

(a) be automatically configured on said local home communications network;

(b) issue HTTP request;

(c) receive HTTP responses containing MIME objects

- (d) display WML and HTML content;
- (e) parse said playlist; and
- (f) mix said playlist with local content.

14. A networked based multimedia delivery system comprising:

- (a) at least one media server for generating a playlist file clips from a plurality of centrally stored multimedia in response to user interaction with a menu generated by the server wherein the user identifies particular clips to be played; and
- (b) a multimedia device in communications with said at least one media server, wherein said media server is configured to authenticate said multimedia device, and wherein the multimedia device is configured to receive the playlist file from the media server and to parse the playlist file to obtain clips and play the specified playlist.

15. (Cancelled)

16. A multimedia device for use in a network based multimedia delivery system comprising:

- (a) means for automatically configuring the multimedia device on a communications network;
- (b) means for displaying at least one media server in communications with the multimedia device over said communications network, wherein said at least one media server has a plurality of stored multimedia clips;
- (c) means for providing authentication information to the at least one media server and for receiving access to said stored plurality of multimedia clips in response to said media server authenticating said multimedia device;
- (d) means for interactively searching said plurality of stored multimedia clips using all or a portion of a text string;
- (e) means for passively searching said plurality of stored multimedia clips;

(f) means for requesting at least one of said plurality of stored multimedia clips from said at least one media server;

(g) means for receiving a remotely generated playlist data file from said at least one media server over said communications network, wherein said remotely generated playlist data file is comprised of data identifying said requested at least one of said plurality of stored multimedia clips;

(h) means for parsing said remotely generated data file; and

(i) means for displaying said remotely generated data file with local data.

17. The method of claim 1, wherein said multimedia device is connected to said media server via a TCP/IP network, and the step of selecting at least one of said plurality of selectable multimedia clips is performed on said media server using a browser interface provided to said multimedia device by said media server.

18. The method of claim 17, wherein said media server generates said playlist in response to said selection of multimedia clips received from said multimedia device.

19. (Cancelled)

20. The method of claim 18, wherein said step of rendering said playlist is performed by the multimedia device, and comprising the further steps of:

parsing said playlist in said multimedia device; and

retrieving digital multimedia files specified in said playlist over said communications network in response to said parsing operation for playback at said multimedia device.

21. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of selecting includes using a portion of a text string, wherein the first few characters of the text string is used to anticipate the entire text string.

22. The method of claim 16, wherein the string is used to anticipate the entire text string.

23. The method of claim 1, wherein the multimedia device is connected to a plurality of media servers that appear to the multimedia device as one entity.

***IX. Evidence Appendix***

None.

***X. Related Proceedings Appendix***

None.